

Socialized Aggression: Hypermasculinity and Sexual Assault in the United States Military

Daniel Schmidt, Bachelor of Arts

A Thesis Research Project Submitted in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
in the field of Applied Communication Studies

Advisory Committee:

Zachary Schaefer, Chair

Wai Hsien Cheah

Eric Wrobbel

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville  
May, 2015

UMI Number: 1588672

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 1588672

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## ABSTRACT

# SOCIALIZED AGGRESSION: HYPERMASCULINITY AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE UNITED STATES MILITARY

by

DANIEL SCHMIDT

Chairperson: Professor Zachary Schaefer

Sexual assault has been identified as an epidemic within the United States military, with estimates of as many as 80% of female service members facing sexual assault or sexual harassment while on active military duty (Turchick & Wilson, 2010). This study examined the sexual assault epidemic as a cultural phenomenon and surveyed 94 male, active duty members of the United States Army. The participants were recruited via network sampling, and their age, time in service, level of socialization, and expectation of combat were measured. A total of four research questions were examined. Multiple correlation analyses identified positive relationships between hypermasculine ideologies and expectation of combat, hypermasculine ideologies and group socialization, and hypermasculine ideologies and task socialization. Negative relationships were identified between hypermasculine ideologies and age, as well as between hypermasculine ideologies and time in service. Data suggests that military Basic Training is an important aspect in the development of hypermasculine ideologies within the United States Army.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	5
Organizational Culture.....	5
Socialization Process .....	7
Anticipatory Phase.....	7
Encounter Phase.....	9
Metamorphosis Phase .....	11
Aggression and Masculinity in the Military .....	13
Female Marginalization in the Military .....	15
Variances of Sexual Assault within Different Military Branches .....	17
III. METHOD .....	20
Respondents .....	20
Procedure .....	21
Variables Measured .....	21
Demographics .....	22
Levels of Socialization.....	22
Dimensions of Hypermasculinity .....	23
Statistical Analysis.....	26
IV. RESULTS .....	27
Research Question 1 .....	27
Research Question 2 .....	27
Research Question 3 .....	28
Organizational Socialization.....	28
Group Socialization .....	28
Task Socialization.....	28
Research Question 4 .....	26
V. DISCUSSION.....	30
Future Research and Limitations .....	34

REFERENCES .....	37
APPENDICES .....	44
A. Informed Consent.....	44
B. Questionnaire .....	46

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Correlations of types of socialization and dimensions of hypermasculinity ...	29

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault in the United States military has been identified by scholars, the media and Congress of the United States as a problem of epidemic proportions (Doyle, 2013; Fox, 2013; Sorcher, 2013). A series of scandals has brought sexual assault in the military to the attention of media and forced the United States Congress to attempt to find a way to remedy the situation. In an unprecedented move, Congress is considering a resolution that would prosecute sexual assault cases independently, as opposed to through the military chain of command (Falcone, 2013).

Media attention to sexual assault in the military has increased as high profile cases of sexual assault have been reported. This attention has also brought criticism of the military investigative and disciplinary process for perpetrators of sexual assault.

In recent years, 30 instructors at Lackland Air Force Base, the location of Air Force basic training, were convicted of committing sexual misconduct crimes against more than 60 victims (Clark, 2014). The most recent high profile sexual assault case from Lackland Air Force Base is a case in which a superior court overturned the sentence and reduced charges against a service member who pled guilty to rape charges and was originally sentenced to four years of confinement and a dishonorable discharge from the military (Clark, 2014).

In March 2014, Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair became the highest ranking military member to ever face a military trial for sexual assault charges. Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair was accused of raping the same victim on two occasions by coercing the victim to perform oral sex against threats of murder and the murder of the victim's family. Rape charges were later dropped due to a lack of credibility of the victim. Although Sinclair

pled guilty to sexual misconduct and general misconduct charges, which held a maximum sentence of 20 years of confinement and a dishonorable discharge from the military, he was sentenced to a reduction in rank to Lieutenant Colonel, ordered to pay a \$20,000 fine, and allowed to retire with full military retirement benefits (Gould, 2014).

Simultaneously to the trial of Brigadier General Jeffrey Sinclair, Major General Ralph Baker was allowed to retire amidst an investigation by military authorities of sexual assault (Lamothe, 2014). Baker was issued a reprimand, a reduction in rank to Brigadier General, and fined an undisclosed amount, with official records indicating that this punishment was for not serving satisfactorily as a Major General while serving as the commander of the United States military's counter-terrorism task force in the Horn of Africa.

Although the previous examples identify only high profile sexual assault allegations, the Department of Defense provides an annual report on sexual assault within the military to the Congress of the United States. The most recent report to Congress provided statistics for sexual assault from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013. This report identified 5,061 allegations of sexual assault, with 5,518 victims of sexual assault (.007% of military service members), and military disciplinary actions against 1,187 perpetrators of sexual assault during this time frame (Department of Defense, 2014).

Academic and civilian studies of sexual assault within the military consistently reject the official Department of Defense statistics as being inaccurate. Independent research of sexual assault statistics in the military are inconsistent, but estimates from previous studies range from 22% to 84% of women in the military will experience sexual assault or sexual harassment during their service in the military (Bastian, Lancaster, & Reyst, 1996; Bostock & Daley, 2007; Coyle, Wolan, & Van Horn, 1996; Kimerling, Gima, Smith, Street, & Frayne, 2007; Murdoch, Pryor, Polusny, & Gackstetter, 2007; Rosen & Martin, 1998;



Skinner et al., 2000; Street, Gradus, Stafford, & Kelly, 2007). Statistics for male victims of sexual assault in the military also vary, ranging from 1% to 11.8%, according to studies analyzed by Turchick and Wilson (2010), with estimations of 14,000 male victims of rape in the year 2013 alone (Fischl, 2014). The extreme variance in statistics between official reporting and independent statistics is attributed to a number of reasons including restrictive access to military personnel, flawed and inconsistent research tools, and research not specifically addressing military personnel while on active duty.

These reporting discrepancies may occur due to the military socialization process. The military socialization process, basic training, places significant emphasis on mutual support between military members and encourages reliance on each other (Greenberg, 2007). This process creates a culture which is considered highly integrated and strongly discourages providing information which could result in the punishment of other service members, even at the risk of personal detriment (Greenberg, 2007). In effect, it creates a culture which encourages the benefit of the organization, occasionally at the expense of the individual. In the context of the sexual assault epidemic, the culture of the military mutes members from reporting sexual assault.

The purpose of this study is to increase the understanding of the sexual assault epidemic within the military by viewing it as a cultural phenomenon. This phenomenon seems to be a by-product of the socialization process military members proceed through upon joining the military, basic training. The primary purpose of basic training is to indoctrinate new military service members into the military culture. This indoctrination process includes providing discipline, conformity, hierarchical knowledge, military knowledge, and combat skills to new service members (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978). Many of the combat skills taught during basic training may have an unintended consequence of encouraging one or more of

the dimensions of hypermasculinity (i.e., sexual identity, dominance and aggression, conservative masculinity, and devaluation of emotion).

This thesis attempts to better understand the culture of the military from an etic stance through quantitative analysis by surveying United States Army service members.

Independent variables of age, time in the military, levels of socialization, and expectation of combat based on military occupational specialty category were measured to identify correlations with the dimensions of hypermasculinity, as well as, hypermasculinity as a combined measure.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to properly understand this phenomenon, it is important to look at past research to understand the frame and scope of the issues. This review of past research will discuss the importance of organizational culture and some of its implications, the socialization process of organizational culture, dimensions of hypermasculinity and how they have affected the military, and official statistics of sexual harassment and sexual assault in the Army.

#### Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a concept with broad and varying definitions, but most scholars agree that culture includes the language, symbols, artifacts, habits, unwritten rules, and taken for granted values which have shared meaning among groups of people (Greenberg, 2007; Martin, 2002; Miller, 2012). Essentially, culture is created, shaped, and reflected in everything from the layout of the building, the name plates (or lack of) on desks, the clothing members wear, the language members use, the jokes members tell (or do not tell), the art on the wall, what members eat for lunch, and more.

Researchers try to understand organizational culture through many methods. Schein (2004) views organizational culture as an onion with three layers which include the artifacts and behaviors, espoused values, and assumptions. Other researchers attempt to understand culture by identifying traits such as values (espoused and concealed) of the organization, the language used by the members, the symbols with which the members identify, and the habits which exist within the organization. Identifying these traits and understanding what each of

these mean to the members of the organization helps describe the true values of the organization.

Researchers tend to view the values, language, symbols, and habits of organizations through different perspectives. Martin (2002) describes the lenses with which to view organizational culture as integrated, differentiated, and fragmented. Integrated cultures are described by Martin (2002) as the traits of culture which exist throughout the organization. This perspective looks for traits which are shared and can create an ultimate solution. Culture is created by leadership and affected by management within the integrated perspective.

The Army, and the military as a whole, is very much an organization of organizations which extends from the individual soldier to the team, team to a squad, squad to a platoon, all the way up to the entirety of the Army. The goal of organizational culture is to understand how these “interlocked actions of collectivity” (Pacanowsky & O’Donell-Trujillo, 1982, p. 122) are able to thrive through communication. An attempt to understand everything within this organization of organization, and to understand the inner-workings of the meanings behind processes, facts about how and why the Army operates in the way it does, the unwritten ways of acting certain ways and to be able to explain an overall picture of the Army (Pacanowsky & O’Donell-Trujillo, 1982).

The organizational culture of the military is most often reflected as and viewed through the integrated perspective due to the standardization within the United States military. Within the different branches of the military (Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force), the values and traits of members are similar, with limited differences. The differences in culture which exist between different specific military units or military branches exist primarily out of necessity for their primary missions. The cultural similarities between different military units and different branches are intentional and are constructed through the

socialization process the United States military has created to transform civilians into military members, basic training.

### Socialization Process

Shared meanings are often passed from existing members of an organization to new members of an organization through a process referred to as socialization. Socialization is broadly defined as “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role” (van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211). This process and acquisition of knowledge and skills is not automatic, it takes time and takes place gradually, with over-lapping time frames instead of cut and dried sections. New members of organizations often times accelerate through the socialization process individually, with some new members creating a connection to the organization more quickly than others.

Researchers generally consider the process through which new members integrate and adapt into new organizations as a socialization process which includes three phases; an anticipatory phase, encounter phase, and metamorphosis phase (Feldman, 1976; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Van Maanen, 1975).

#### *Anticipatory phase*

The anticipatory phase of the socialization process begins prior to actual entry into the organization. This phase begins, in some ways, from the moment people are born. Jablin (1987) divides this phase into two sub-parts, the vocational anticipatory socialization, and the organizational anticipatory socialization sections. According to Jablin (1987), vocational anticipatory socialization is marked by understanding work, the process of work, and an understanding of organizations in the most basic forms. This sub-part to the anticipatory phase essentially begins from the time of birth, with people gaining the most basic understanding of work. Future service members of the United States military learn about the

military during the earliest phases of the vocational anticipatory socialization phase, and in many cases the organizational anticipatory socialization phase far earlier than they would in many other organizations. Portrayals of the military by media within books, magazines, news and movies are pervasive within the United States. These portrayals of the military are not always accurate, often in an effort to romanticize or dramatize military service.

Non-military service members have little access to information about the military except through media reporting. Therefore, the anticipatory phase of socialization is primarily through media. Privera and Howard (2006) found that civilian media marginalizes female service members. They found that media coverage of the 507th Ordinance Maintenance Company soldiers who were captured in Iraq had drastically different media coverage when discussing the male soldiers compared to the female soldiers. The authors analyzed all media from the three major television networks in the United States; ABC, CBS, and NBC, from March 23, 2003 through January 13, 2004. In total, 218 stories and 439 pages were analyzed. This study found that the media represents men in the military as warrior heroes and women predominantly for their appearance and for show, even when soldiers of both genders have the same military specialty and were captured while conducting the exact same mission.

Members of the United States military originate as civilians of the United States (in most cases). These civilians come to the military with their own shared understanding and meaning, their own culture, which they've experienced and had a joint understanding of prior to joining the military. Howard and Privera (2006) showed that civilians, the same ones who may choose to become members of the United States military, in the United States have an expectation for military service members to have a high propensity toward violence and seem to support it. They found that there are close ties between nationalistic identity and

traits of the "ideal soldier". Civilians identified a number of traits they considered to represent the traits of the "ideal soldier", some of these traits were aggression, assertiveness, and dominance (Howard & Privedera, 2006). Howard and Privedera (2006) stated "the vast majority of responses [in their study] supported masculine conceptions of soldiering and its relation to the state: soldiers fight, kill, and die" (p. 139). Howard and Privedera (2006) quoted a participant in the study that the "ideal soldier" is "a healthy, strong, skilled, person that doesn't panic. This ideal soldier would be more like an animal than a man" (p. 143). The authors reflected that "being 'more like an animal than a man' can have nothing but serious consequences to the soldier that, despite this 'goal' is human" (p. 144); and "those who do feel compassion, fear, and regret are often marginalized for not being a 'real soldier" (p. 144). These expectations are part of the understanding civilians bring with them to the military when they become service members.

### *Encounter phase*

The encounter phase of the socialization process begins upon entry into the new organization. This phase is when a new member of an organization begins to let go of assumed values of an organization and accept the true roles and values of the organization (Feldman, 1976; Jablin, 1987; Porter et al., 1975; Van Maanen, 1975). New members of the United States military proceed through the encounter phase of the socialization process during Basic Military Training. Basic training varies by name and length of training by service organization, but the premise is similar, to provide new service members a base level of understanding of the differences from the civilian culture they have experienced previously to the new culture they have joined, the military. Essentially, to break down the civilian identity of the new member and rebuild the individual as a soldier.

Although any specific stereotype should be avoided while discussing the sociodemographics of military members, the military is primarily composed of service members who are male, 18-24 years old, with high school as their highest education level, and come from lower socioeconomic status than the general population. According to Turchick and Wilson (2010), each of these demographic groups represent a group with a higher rate of sexual assault in the civilian world. The military is often considered a “snapshot” of the society in general, with each group partially represented within the military, although this may be true, certain demographic groups are over-represented within the military in comparison to the society of the United States. These over-represented demographics are clearly males who are from 18-24 years old. This specific age and gender group enter the encounter phase of the socialization process and are indoctrinated by military basic training at a time when many individuals, and society at large, expect the formalization of the adult gender role/identity. This indoctrination, therefore, has a stronger and longer lasting effect on the members (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978).

The culture of an organization dictates all the unwritten rules for that organization, it shapes the behaviors of the members to define what is acceptable and what is unacceptable. The culture of an organization can shape how members feel and react to any number of situations, even situations which could be considered heinous within other groups and cultures (Dougherty & Smythe, 2004). Identifying these traits and understanding what each of these traits mean to the members of the organization helps describe the true values of the organization. The shared values and experiences of the members are partially shaped from their experiences prior to military service, in this case, groups with higher than average rates of sexual assault and indoctrinated into an organization at a time when many are expected to formalize their gender roles and identities.



The primary purpose of military basic training is to indoctrinate new members into the military culture, to create members with similar ideals, values and beliefs which benefit the greater organization (the military branch, military in general, and the United States as a whole). Greenberg (2007) discusses the emphasis the military places on mutual support between military members. This emphasis on mutual support encourages close reliance on members for both physical and psychological needs. The cultural implications of this emphasis are that it encourages a strong and deeply integrated culture amongst its members.

The strong and deeply integrated culture of military service members is created during basic training. New service members learn military definitions, to have shared meanings, shared values, and shared beliefs which are created and defined by the United States military. Essentially, the military belief system becomes the individual's belief system (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978). This belief system is strongly centered on the importance of obeying orders and conforming to official norms and attitudes.

Part of this belief system is required to be acceptance of violence. This is necessary due to the primary function of service members to fight or support fights on behalf of the United States. Exposure to violence begins for military members early during Basic Combat Training and continues through military service with consistent combat training, and possible deployments to combat areas around the world. This exposure to violence shapes much of the military culture and then normalizes soldiers to violence and aggression. Turchick and Wilson (2010) note that during World War II many service members intentionally shot over their enemies' heads due to hesitation of violence. Following World War II, military training focused on desensitizing service members to violence for combat superiority by exposing soldiers to violence early and often and by focusing training on realistic situations and scenarios to normalize soldiers to violence.

### *Metamorphosis phase*

The metamorphosis phase of the socialization process is reached when a new member is accepted as an organizational member by the existing members. It is marked by the shared meaning, values, and beliefs as the other members of the organization (Feldman, 1976; Jablin, 1987; Porter et al., 1975; Van Maanen, 1975). The United States military accepts that new members are a part of their organization upon completion of basic training, although the new member still has additional training to learn their specific job skills and will go through portions of the socialization process as they enter new specific units of the military. This phase of the socialization process differs within the military from many other organizations in that most organizations would not consider the metamorphosis phase reached until the culture of the organization is accepted by the new member, as well as the job related skills (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978). This difference is important to note within the United States military in order to identify that the military emphasis on membership is on the basic military skills, not the specific job related skills that will be learned later.

New members are welcomed into the metamorphosis phase upon completion of basic training through a grand military ceremony which literally parades the new members discipline and conformity to behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, and values (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978). New members have transitioned through basic training and been transformed into a piece of the United States military fighting force.

Although the form and content of basic training is similar in each of the branches of the military, the intensity and focus of the training varies, mainly based on the primary mission of the military branch. The Marine Corps and Army are perceived to have primary missions to conduct direct confrontation with an enemy, whereas the Navy and Air Force are generally perceived to be support elements with combat capabilities (Arkin & Dobrofsky,

1978). Newly accepted members of the military are expected to maintain the discipline, conformity, and combat skills indoctrinated into the new members throughout their membership within the organization; their specific branch of the United States military. The skills and experiences of basic training help to create the military culture. Each of the branches have their own aspects of culture, although, the culture within each branch is similar. The cultural differences within each branch are not in discipline or conformity, but are in regard to the focus and intensity on combat related skills. The focus on combat related skills shows itself in many ways in the culture of each branch of the military, often times with a more dramatically aggressive and masculine identity in the culture of the Marine Corps and Army.

#### Aggression and Masculinity in the Military

Intensity and focus on combat related skills are more dramatic in branches of the military which are perceived to have heightened expectations of direct confrontation with an enemy. The increased intensity and focus on combat skills which exists within Army and Marine basic training is focused on the ability to kill the enemy and suppressing emotions in order to maintain control and discipline. The suppression of emotions such as fear and empathy is encouraged due to these emotions conveyance of vulnerability (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988); however, anger is one emotion which military members are expected to embrace, in that anger often causes increased aggression and acceptance of violence (Levant, 1995). One cannot strike fear into their enemy if they themselves have a semblance of vulnerability, but certainly can if they show signs of anger.

Violence and combat are not wholly natural acts for humans, witnessed by Turchick and Wilson (2010) showing service members' reactions to direct combat during World War II. The socialization process new military service members face during basic training; harsh

discipline, punishment for avoiding combat (desertion, etc) and rewards for fighting (medals, etc) is to counter this unnatural feeling and indoctrinate new service members to accept violence. Enloe (1993, page 253) stated “If masculinity “in the raw” were sufficient, there would be little need for the sweat, blisters, and humiliations of basic training”. The additional sweat, blisters, and humiliations of basic training are directed at shaping new service members into the violent and aggressive military model of masculinity.

The military model of masculinity places special emphasis on acceptance of violence. Mosher and Sirkin (1984) showed that the capability of committing violent acts becomes not only acceptable, but actually becomes preferable within the military. The focus on acceptance of violence and suppression of emotions is considered to embody the traditional view of masculinity. The reward system (medals) designed by the military is stressed throughout the socialization process. Some military medals such as the Purple Heart and Medal of Honor are revered and recognized in the earliest stage of the socialization process, the anticipatory phase. This reverence and recognition is through media portrayals, storytelling, even specialized license plates to honor military members who have faced the most violent of situations. Basic training only increases the reverence for medals by teaching new members the differences between medals, even differentiating certain medals by identifying whether the military service member received the medal for combat activities or administrative activities (Bronze Star versus Bronze Star with “v” device, in which case the “v” device stands for “Valor”).

Aggression, assertiveness, and dominance were identified, and discussed previously, as traits civilians encouraged military service members to have (Howard & Prividera, 2006). Thompson and Cracco (2008) conducted a study to assess men's sexual aggressiveness to identify if men who were more sexually aggressive followed particular gender scripts. This

research identified that sexual aggressiveness could be predicted by the toughness factor of masculinity ideology. They showed that certain environments can go further than increasing aggressive male behavior, but can actually normalize behaviors which endorse the marginalization of women and encourage other males to act in a more assertive, dominant and riskier manner. Sexually aggressive behaviors were considered part of the culture of the environment, a rite of passage of being in certain environments. Thompson and Cracco (2008) showed, "sexually aggressive men are also younger, heterosexual, unmarried and embody the dominant culture's masculinity expectations as they describe themselves in terms of instrumental attributes (e.g., being assertive, dominant, willing to take risks, forceful)" (p. 89-90). Many of the traits shown by Thompson and Cracco (2008) to predict sexually aggressive behavior in bars (being assertive, dominant and willing to take risks) are traits expected and encouraged by the military.

#### Female Marginalization in the Military

The military is a male-dominated organization both statistically, due to the low ratios of women to men, and structurally, due to the majority of men outranking women. This led Morris (1996) to argue that the culture of the military is led by the group-identity structure of masculinity. Morris (1996) found that masculinity is at the heart of military socialization, that attitudes of sexuality are embodied in the military and that "women are cast largely as the sexual adversary or target, while men are cast largely as promiscuous sexual hunters" (p. 710). These attitudes of sexuality by military members create an environment that in many ways seems similar to the environment identified by Thompson and Cracco (2008) to normalize sexually aggressive behavior.

The combination of male dominance along with women identified as sexual adversaries creates an environment in which females are marginalized within the military.

The United States Army, for example, breaks job specialties into three categories; combat arms, combat support and combat service. Combat arms specialties are those which are trained most directly to conduct combat against an enemy and include specialties such as infantry, artillery, or tankers. Support specialties are those which directly support combat such as communication or intelligence. Service specialties are those which provide a service for the military in general such as finance, cooks, or fuelers. One of the fundamental ideologies taught at Basic Training is that all the military specialties exist in support of the combat arms specialties. The combat arms specialties are the heart of the military and are glorified by the military (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978). Most of the military specialties which are not available to females are combat specialties such as infantry, armor (tankers), etc.. Excluding females from these combat specialties marginalizes the importance of females in the military by excluding them from the military specialties which are most idolized within the military.

The marginalization of female soldiers and exclusion from combat specialties was codified within military culture in 1948 when the Women's Armed Services Act was passed. Holland (2006) explains that female soldiers have difficulty with promotions because they lack combat experiences which are highly regarded within the military. She continues that female soldiers who can meet the male soldiering standards face ridicule for lacking femininity, and female soldiers who are unable to meet male soldiering standards are devalued and criticized for not being combat capable. This marginalization has been shown to create an environment that is more comfortable for the dominant gender to commit sexual assault (Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001).

Marginalizing female military members within the military and the media while simultaneously encouraging masculinity encourages a culture of hypermasculinity, one

which encourages behavior that exaggerates stereotypical male behavior and emphasizes strength and aggression (Thompson & Cracco, 2008). Hypermasculinity is posed to be represented by four dimensions; dominance & aggression, sexual identity, conservative masculinity, and devaluation of emotion (Burk, Burkhart, & Sikorski, 2004). Clearly, all four dimensions are present in the military to varying degrees. Corprew, Matthews and Mitchell (2014) found that the presence of these four dimensions lead to four different types of masculine ideological environments; extreme hypermasculinity, traditional masculine, traditional hypermasculine, and non-hypermasculine. Each of these four types of masculine ideological environments can have various outcomes, based on the level of each dimension (dominance and aggression, sexual identity, anti-femininity, and devaluation of emotion).

#### Variations of Sexual Assault within Different Military Branches

The legal term “sexual assault” varies in differing jurisdictions throughout the United States. The Department of Defense (2014) defines “sexual assault” as:

Intentional sexual contact characterized by use of force, threats, intimidation, or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. Sexual assault includes rape, forcible sodomy (oral or anal sex), and other unwanted sexual contact that is aggravated, abusive, or wrongful (including unwanted and inappropriate sexual contact), or attempts to commit these acts. (p. 62)

United States Department of Defense and within each of the separate branches of the United States military. Although the definition is shared within each branch of the military, reporting of sexual assault varies between the different branches.

The Department of Defense is required to provide a report to Congress on sexual assault each fiscal year. This report updates Congress on future plans to reduce sexual assault within the military, updates Congress on the status of ongoing plans to reduce sexual assault

in the military, discloses reports of sexual assault within the Department of Defense, breaks down the reports of sexual assault in each branch of the military, and explains the outcome of investigations of reports of sexual assault. 5,061 allegations of sexual assault were reported within the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2013 (Department of Defense, 2014). The 5,061 reports of sexual assault identified 5,518 victims of sexual assault and 2,149 alleged assailants, of which 1,187 alleged assailants faced disciplinary action (Department of Defense, 2014).

Department of Defense sexual assault reporting involves two separate reporting processes, selected by the victim, in an effort to increase the accuracy of reporting statistics. An unrestricted report of sexual assault initiates a formal criminal investigation. This reporting process identified 2,149 alleged assailants, of which 1,187 alleged assailants faced disciplinary action. The second reporting process is restricted reporting. The restricted reporting process provides support to sexual assault victims, collects the report for statistical purposes, but does not initiate an investigation to identify an alleged assailant (Department of Defense, 2014). These different reporting processes help assist in explaining the significant discrepancy in sexual assault reporting versus alleged assailants/disciplinary actions against alleged assailants.

Reports of sexual assault vary widely between the different branches of the United States military and are reported by the Department of Defense by reports per 1,000 members in an effort to compensate for the varying numbers of service members within each branch. In fiscal year 2013 there were 3.8 reports of sexual assault per 1,000 members within the Marine Corps, 3.6 within the Army, 3.2 within the Navy, and 2.9 within the Air Force (Department of Defense, 2014). These statistics of sexual assault reporting seem to coincide with the expected levels of intensity and focus on combat skills during basic



training, as discussed by Arkin and Dobrofsky (1978). This thesis focused on understanding any relationships between the Army culture and the sexual assault epidemic within the Army by determining:

**RQ1.** Is age related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?

**RQ2.** Is time in service related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?

**RQ3.** Are the different types of socialization related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?

**RQ4.** Is combat expectation related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

This study utilized the cross-sectional survey research design to examine whether the different dimensions of hypermasculinity are related to age, time in service, combat expectation, and the different types of socialization process in the Army. The cross-sectional survey research design was used to identify hypermasculine ideologies within the military, identify trends in the ideologies, and identify if these ideologies originate within the military as part of the socialization process. The goal of this study required a large sample of cases in an effort to represent the overall population of interest.

#### Respondents

A purposive sample of 94 active duty, male members of the United States Army participated in this study. Respondents were from diverse backgrounds in regard to their age, military rank, military occupational specialty, and time in service. The mean respondent age was 30.34 years and ranged from 19 to 51 years. The mean respondent time in service was 118 months and ranged from six months to 366 months. Respondent military occupational specialty was 45.7% combat arms, 27.7% combat support, and 13.8% combat service.

Respondents were identified by network sampling techniques. The respondents were identified through the Army network of the author. As an Army veteran, the author was able to contact former colleagues through e-mails and other social media platforms for recruitment purposes. Respondents interested in participating in this study were directed to the link for the online questionnaire, created on Qualtrics. An example of the participation request sent to former colleagues of the researcher follows:

“I’m finishing up my grad school and need participants for a survey. If you are interested, it will only take about 15 minutes is anonymous. If you know anyone else that is interested in helping me out, please share the link with them, as long as they are active duty, male, and in the Army.”

Additional participants were recruited through numerous online forums frequented by military personnel. Forum hosts were provided a link to the questionnaire and asked to post the link, along with a message on their forum. An example of the forum request follows:

“I’m a former Army SFC who is now pursuing a Master's degree and am working on my thesis. Overall, I'm trying to figure out a way to reduce the amount of sexual assault in the military. I was hoping you guys could do me a favor and post a link to my survey. It's anonymous, takes about 15 minutes, and is really just for active duty male members of the Army. Any assistance you guys could provide would be very much appreciated.”

### Procedure

Upon reaching the Qualtrics page, the respondents were first asked to read the consent description, and indicate their respective age towards the end. Brief information about the purpose of the study, and the contact information of the researcher, faculty supervisor and the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) were provided. The anonymity of the questionnaire, the right of the participants to skip any questions, including stopping their participation at any time during the study were also emphasized. To be eligible for the study, the respondents were required to be 18 years and older. Participants not meeting the age requirement were not allowed to proceed with the questionnaire. On average, the participants took approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

### Variables Measured

The variable measured in this study include demographics, socialization, and hypermasculinity.

### *Demographics*

The respondents' gender, age, time in service, military pay grade, and military occupational specialty were measured.

To determine their respective time in service, the respondents were asked to indicate the month and year when they first joined the United States Army. Based on the start date, the total months in service through April 2015 was then calculated. For instance, a start date of September 1999 through April 2015 is equivalent to 187 months. Military occupational specialty was identified by respondents as their military job code. The researcher categorized these occupational specialties as combat service, combat support, or combat arms based on United States Army classifications (e.g., 11B, Infantry was categorized as combat arms, 3; 88M, Motor Transport Operator was categorized as combat support, 2; 42A, Human Resources Specialist was categorized as combat service, 1). These classifications follow United States Army expectations of combat during conflict.

### *Levels of socialization*

The respondents' socialization into the United States Army was assessed using Haueter, Macan and Winter's (2003) Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire. This questionnaire consists of three subscales which measured the respondents' organizational, group, and task socialization processes respectively. Organizational socialization is a process through which an individual becomes a member of an organization. Group socialization is a process through which an individual becomes a member of a group within a larger organization. Task socialization is a process through which an individual understands the functions and tasks they are expected to fulfill within an organization.

Respondents' level of organizational socialization was assessed using seven 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Haueter et al.'s (2003) Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire, (e.g., "I know the Army's objectives and goals," "I understand how various other units contribute to the Army's goals"). The response options ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." These items were combined to form an organizational socialization score, where a high score indicated strong socialization and a low score identified weak socialization. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.95$ ).

The respondents' level of group socialization was assessed using five 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Haueter et al.'s (2003) Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire, (e.g., "I know my work group's (e.g., team, squad, platoon) objectives," "I understand the expertise (e.g., skill, knowledge) each member brings to my particular group (e.g., team, squad, platoon)"). The response options ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." These items were combined to form a group socialization score, where a high score indicated strong socialization and a low score identified weak socialization. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.90$ ).

Respondents' level of task socialization was assessed using eight 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Haueter et al.'s (2003) Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire, (e.g., "I know who I support," "I know how to meet the requirements of those I support"). The response options ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." These items were combined to form a task socialization score, where a high score indicated strong socialization and a low score identified weak socialization. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.94$ ).

*Dimensions of hypermasculinity*

The respondents' dimensions of hypermasculinity were assessed using Burk et al.'s (2004) Auburn Differential Masculinity Inventory (ADMI-60). This questionnaire consists of five subscales which measured the respondents' hypermasculinity, sexual identity, dominance and aggression, conservative masculinity, and devaluation of emotion respectively.

Hypermasculinity is a term for the exaggeration of male stereotypical behavior, such as an emphasis on physical strength, aggression, and sexuality. Sexual identity focuses on beliefs that sex is an act of power and aggression which devalues intimacy. Dominance and aggression identified beliefs which emphasize aggression to enforce dominance and control over others. Conservative masculinity identified beliefs of exaggerated male stereotypes which reduce intimacy. Devaluation of emotion identified beliefs that emotional expression, especially emotions showing fear or sadness, are negative.

Respondents' level of hypermasculinity was assessed using 16 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Burk et al.'s (2004) (2004) ADMI-60, (e.g., "I consider men superior to women in intellect," "I think women who say they are feminists are just trying to be like men"). The response options ranged from "Not at all like me" to "Just like me." These items were combined to form a hypermasculinity score, where a high score indicated high hypermasculinity and a low score identified low hypermasculinity. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.96$ ).

Respondents' level of sexual identity was assessed using 14 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Burk et al.'s (2004) ADMI-60, (e.g., "I don't feel guilty for long when I cheat on my girlfriend/wife," "There are two kinds of women: the kind I date and the kind I would marry"). The response options ranged from "Not at all like me" to "Just like me." These items were combined to form a sexual identity score, where a high score indicated high

sexual identity and a low score identified low sexual identity. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.92$ ).

Respondents' level of dominance and aggression was assessed using 16 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Burk et al.'s (2004) ADMI-60, (e.g., "If another man made a pass at my girlfriend/wife, I would tell him off," "I believe sometimes you've got to fight or people will walk all over you"). The response options ranged from "Not at all like me" to "Just like me." These items were combined to form a dominance and aggression score, where a high score indicated high dominance and aggression and a low score identified low dominance and aggression. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.90$ ).

Respondents' level of conservative masculinity was assessed using 14 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Burk et al.'s (2004) ADMI-60, (e.g., "If I had a son I'd be sure to show him what a real man should do," "I like to brag about my sexual conquests to my friends"). The response options ranged from "Not at all like me" to "Just like me." These items were combined to form a conservative masculinity score, where a high score indicated high conservative masculinity and a low score identified low conservative masculinity. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.92$ ).

Respondents' level of devaluation of emotion was assessed using five 5-point-Likert-type items adapted from Burk et al.'s (2004) ADMI-60, (e.g., "I think men who show their emotions frequently are sissies," "I think men who cry are weak"). The response options ranged from "Not at all like me" to "Just like me." These items were combined to form a devaluation of emotion score, where a high score indicated high devaluation of emotion and a low score identified low devaluation of emotion. Overall, these items produced very high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.89$ ).

### Statistical Analyses

The four research questions were tested using multiple correlation analyses, with significance level set at  $p < 0.05$ .



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Research Question 1

RQ1 asked “Is age related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?” Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there were significant relationships between age and sexual identity,  $r(48) = -.34, p < .05$ , age and conservative masculinity,  $r(49) = -.33, p < .05$ , and age and devaluation of emotion,  $r(48) = -.32, p < .05$ . The results here suggest as age increases, the participants’ levels of sexual identity, conservative masculinity, and devaluation of emotion decrease.

Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there was no significant relationship between age and hypermasculinity,  $r(46) = -.23, p > .05$ , or age and dominance and aggression,  $r(48) = -.05, p > .05$ .

#### Research Question 2

RQ2 asked “Is time in service related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?” Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there were significant relationships between time in service and hypermasculinity,  $r(46) = -.29, p < .05$ , time in service and sexual identity,  $r(48) = -.43, p < .05$ , time in service and conservative masculinity,  $r(49) = -.40, p < .05$ , and time in service and devaluation of emotion,  $r(48) = -.36, p < .05$ . The results here suggest that as time in service increases, the participants’ levels of hypermasculinity, sexual identity, conservative masculinity, and devaluation of emotion decrease.

Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there was no significant relationship between time in service and dominance and aggression,  $r(48) = -.12, p > .05$ .

### Research Question 3

RQ3 asked “Are different types of socialization related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?”

#### *Organizational socialization*

Multiple correlation analyses revealed there was no significant relationship between organizational socialization and hypermasculinity,  $r(43) = .22, p > .05$ , organizational socialization and sexual identity,  $r(45) = .27, p > .05$ , organizational socialization and dominance and aggression,  $r(45) = .12, p > .05$ , organizational socialization and conservative masculinity,  $r(46) = .28, p > .05$ , or organizational socialization and devaluation of emotion,  $r(45) = .06, p > .05$ .

#### *Group socialization*

Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there was a significant relationship between group socialization and conservative masculinity,  $r(48) = .29, p < .05$ . The result here suggests that as group socialization increases, levels of conservative masculinity increases.

Multiple correlation analyses revealed there was no significant relationship between group socialization and hypermasculinity,  $r(45) = .27, p > .05$ , group socialization and sexual identity,  $r(47) = .27, p > .05$ , group socialization and dominance and aggression,  $r(47) = .21, p > .05$ , or group socialization and devaluation of emotion,  $r(47) = .19, p > .05$ .

#### *Task socialization*

Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there was a significant relationship between task socialization and conservative masculinity,  $r(49) = .28, p < .05$ . The result here suggests that as task socialization increased, levels of conservative masculinity increases.

Multiple correlation analyses revealed there was no significant relationship between task socialization and hypermasculinity,  $r(46) = .22, p > .05$ , task socialization and sexual identity,  $r(48) = .23, p > .05$ , task socialization and dominance and aggression,  $r(48) = .22, p > .05$ , or task socialization and devaluation of emotion,  $r(48) = .14, p > .05$ .

**Table 1.** Correlations of types of socialization and dimensions of hypermasculinity

	H	SI	DA	CM	DE
Organizational Socialization	.22	.27	.12	.28	.06
Group Socialization	.27	.27	.21	.29*	.19
Task Socialization	.22	.23	.22	.28*	.14

*Notes.* Dimensions of hypermasculinity abbreviated Hypermasculinity (H), Sexual identity (SI), Dominance and aggression (DA), Conservative masculinity (CM), and Devaluation of emotion (DE).

\* $p < .05$

#### Research Question 4

RQ4 asked “Is combat expectation related to the different dimensions of hypermasculinity?” Multiple correlation analyses revealed that there were significant relationships between expectation of combat and hypermasculinity,  $r(46) = .36, p < .05$ , expectation of combat and dominance and aggression,  $r(48) = .41, p < .05$ , and expectation of combat and devaluation of emotion,  $r(48) = .32, p < .05$ . The results here suggest as expectation of combat increases, the participants levels of hypermasculinity, dominance and aggression, and devaluation of emotion increase.

Multiple correlation analyses revealed there was no significant relationship between expectation of combat and sexual identity,  $r(48) = .20, p > .05$ , or expectation of combat and conservative masculinity,  $r(49) = .27, p > .05$ .

## CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to understand the sexual assault epidemic within the United States Military as a cultural phenomenon and identify relationships between hypermasculine ideologies and age, hypermasculine ideologies and time in service, hypermasculine ideologies and levels of socialization, and hypermasculine ideologies and combat expectation.

A negative relationship was identified between hypermasculine ideologies and age which shows that as respondents' age increased, their levels of hypermasculine ideologies decreased. A number of extraneous variables are likely to interplay to cause this relationship including, but certainly not limited to maturity, physiological changes, and additional relationship experience. This negative relationship is in line with Turchick and Wilson (2010) who identified that males aged 18-24 show higher rates of sexual assault in non-military environments.

A negative relationship was identified between hypermasculine ideologies and time in service which shows that as a respondents' time in service increased, their levels of hypermasculine ideologies decreased. Although many of the same extraneous variables are likely to cause this negative relationship as in the relationship between age and hypermasculine ideologies, it is important to note that the negative relationships shown in RQ 2 are stronger negative relationships than identified in RQ1. Bivariate correlation analysis identified that a significant relationship between age and time in service,  $r(80) = .86$ ,  $p < .05$ . The significant relationship between age and time in service, but stronger negative relationships shown in RQ2 may be an indication that sexual assault prevention programs

within the Army have a stronger influence on declining levels of hypermasculine ideologies than age alone, although many other extraneous variables could influence this relationship as well.

Relationships were identified between conservative masculinity and group socialization as well as task socialization. Although the subscale used to identify the level of organizational socialization process of participants was shown to be highly reliable, no significant relationship with any dimension of hypermasculinity was found.

The lack of relationship between organizational socialization and the dimensions of hypermasculinity was unexpected due to media reports and previous academic research that has identified sexual assault as a significant issue within the military (Clark, 2014; Department of Defense, 2014; Doyle, 2013; Fox, 2013; Gould, 2014; Lamothe, 2014; Sorcher, 2013; Turchick and Wilson, 2010). Additionally, relationships were expected based on previous research showing that levels of hypermasculine ideologies are higher in environments with similar traits as the United States Army (Thompson & Cracco, 2008). Finally, the lack of relationship was unexpected due to many of the traits associated with hypermasculine ideologies being both trained and encouraged by the military during Basic Training (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978; Enloe, 1993; Levant, 1995; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988; Morris, 1996; Thompson & Cracco, 2008; Turchick & Wilson, 2010). Previous studies which identified all these factors seemed to indicate that the organizational culture of the Army created, or at a minimum perpetuated, the hypermasculine ideologies. The combination of all these factors seemed to indicate that the relationship between organizational socialization and each of the dimensions of hypermasculinity would be positively correlated due to prolonged exposure in the environment. The lack of relationship between organizational socialization and the dimensions of hypermasculinity

indicate that the culture of the Army, as a whole entity, does not seem to create or perpetuate hypermasculine ideologies.

When viewing the lack of relationship between organizational socialization and dimensions of hypermasculinity in conjunction with the relationships which were identified, a different view emerges. The view which seems to emerge is that a relationship was not identified because all participants had already reached the metamorphosis stage of socialization, the highest level of organizational socialization. The final level of organizational socialization is marked by preexisting organizational members accepting new members as part of their organization, based on shared meanings, values, and beliefs as other members of the organization (Feldman, 1976; Jablin, 1987; Porter et al., 1975; Van Maanen, 1975). Upon completion of initial training schools, soldiers share similar basic meanings, values, and beliefs with other, preexisting, members of the organization.

The view that the lack of variable relationship could be based on all participants having already reached the highest level of socialization could be important when considering the negative relationships between both age and time in military service with the dimensions of hypermasculinity. These negative relationships support research showing the traits associated with hypermasculine ideologies being both trained and encouraged by the military during Basic Training (Arkin and Dobrofsky, 1978; Enloe, 1993; Levant, 1995; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988; Morris, 1996; Thompson & Cracco, 2008; Turchick & Wilson, 2010). The negative relationships seem to identify that the highest levels of hypermasculine ideologies would be identified in the youngest soldiers, with the least time in service. The youngest soldiers with the least time in service, generally, are those who have recently completed military Basic Training.

Initial considerations of the findings of this research may cause questions of its validity based on the highly integrated culture of the United States Army, and the military in general. However, as an organization of organizations, there are sub-cultures within the military which exist, as stated previously, at the team, squad, platoon, and higher echelons within the military. These different groups within the larger organization of the Army have many shared meanings with other groups within the Army, however, their processes may differ slightly. The different processes may include different leadership styles, varying degrees of combat expectation, and specific tactics, techniques and procedures determined at the group level. These slight variations may help explain why significant relationships were identified at the group and task levels of socialization with conservative masculinity.

Although these various echelons within the Army share many cultural traits, organizations have not been shown to have one, singular, culture (Miller, 2012). Each separate organization within the Army has its' own specific culture which shares traits with the rest of the Army. One of the many factors which affects the culture of specific organizations within the Army, and the entirety of the Army, are the variations of intensity and focus on combat related skills, as discussed by Arkin and Dobrofsky (1978). This factor is supported in the present research, as well as in official Department of Defense statistics (Department of Defense, 2014), by showing a significant relationship between participants' military occupational specialty category and the dimensions of hypermasculinity, especially ideologies of devaluation of emotion, hypermasculinity, and dominance and aggression.

The identified relationships between military occupational specialty category and dimensions of hypermasculinity are especially problematic when trying to reduce the prevalence of sexual assault in the military. Military personnel who are dominant and aggressive with little value for emotion is what the United States public seems to encourage

(Howard & Prividera, 2006). The purpose of the military is to participate in war on behalf of the United States. This is an inherently violent purpose which, could be argued, requires dominance, aggression, and the ability to control/devalue emotions.

Based on the findings of this study, the United States Army should continue efforts to reduce instances of sexual assault through established programs. Additionally, it seems that the Army should place special emphasis on the socialization process of Basic Training. Basic Training provides the United States Army with the ability to dramatically affect their culture in a highly effective and efficient way which few other organizations can. Basic Training allows the Army to control nearly every aspect of the environment to indoctrinate new members. Identifying ways to adjust the curriculum of Basic Training to focus new members' dominance, aggression, and ability to control/devalue emotions specifically to combat settings could prove an effective method for reducing sexual assault.

#### Future Research and Limitations

Replication of this study should attempt to receive formal approval through military channels to ensure cooperation of senior leadership. Formal military approval could allow for a significantly increased sample size and allow for improved sampling methods.

Additional variables should be tested to identify possible relationships with hypermasculine ideologies. This study analyzed a relationship between combat expectation and hypermasculine ideologies, however, analysis of relationships between actual combat experience and hypermasculine ideologies, and violence normalization and hypermasculine ideologies could be important factors to improve the understanding of the sexual assault epidemic in the Army.

This study was focused on the organizational culture of the Army, future studies of this topic may be improved by utilizing qualitative methods of research, specifically



ethnographic methods. Ethnographic methods could better distinguish the many varying manifestations and systematic beliefs amongst members. A true longitudinal ethnography of this topic should begin with participants prior to joining the military in order to identify how the dimensions of hypermasculinity are affected throughout an individual's military service and specifically how they are affected through Basic Training. The historical importance and intentional usage of sexual assault as a means of dominance, and in many ways a tool of war, should be viewed to identify if any manifestations exist in the modern United States Army.

Data collected for this research was restricted to active duty male members of the United States Army in order to isolate participants as an initial research project, future research should include members of other military branches to identify if data is generalizable throughout the military, or how it deviates. Future research should also include female military members in that the sexual assault epidemic within the military is not restricted to female victims nor to strictly male assailants.

This research was based on data collected through a network sampling method, from 94 members of an organization with over 400,000 active duty members (Department of Defense, 2014), making it difficult to truly generalize. The number of participants was partially restricted due to a lack of formal military approval. Numerous military organizations were contacted in an effort to increase participation. Each request for assistance was rejected due to military restrictions. Additionally, the sample size was limited due to researcher determined restrictions such as the focus specifically on current Army soldiers, restricting the research to active duty personnel, and only surveying male soldiers.

Variables measured in this study identified many relationships, however, many extraneous variables may exist which impact these relationships. Maturity, relationship experience, social influence, physiological factors, legal ramifications, and many other

variables were not measured, therefore, this study cannot, and was not intended to, identify a causal relationship.

This study also had an unusually high attrition rate, 34%, with additional questions left unanswered by respondents. The average time to complete the questionnaire was less than 15 minutes. The researcher did not conclude this attrition rate was due to the length, nor the distribution method for the questionnaire. The researcher concluded that the high attrition rate was most likely due to the highly integrated culture of the Army and the fear of the soldiers to disclose potentially harmful information, as explained by Greenberg (2007). Analysis of attrition and incomplete questionnaires identified no significant relationship between questionnaire completion and respondents' age, time in service, or military occupational specialty.

The Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire showed exceptionally high reliability within this study. However, this questionnaire focused on questions which are emphasized to soldiers during Basic Training. This questionnaire does not seem to be capable of distinguishing the many varying manifestations and systematic beliefs amongst members of the Army.

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A., & Buck, P.O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16* (8), 784-807. doi: 10.1177/088626001016008004
- Arkin, W., & Dobrofsky, L.R. (1978). Military socialization and masculinity. *Journal of Social Issues, 34* (1), 151-168. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560
- Bastian, L.D., Lancaster, A.R. & Reyst, H.E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 sexual harassment survey*. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. Retrieved from <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA323942>
- Bostock, D.J., & Daley, G. (2007). Lifetime and current sexual assault and harassment victimization rates of active-duty United States Air Force women. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 927-944. doi: 10.1177/1077801207305232
- Burk, L.R., Burkhart, B.R., & Sikorski, J.F. (2004). Construction and preliminary validation of the Auburn differential masculinity inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*, 4-17. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.4
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38* (2), 217-230. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217
- Burnett, A., Mattern, J.L., Herakova, L.L., Kahl, D.R., Tobola, C. & Bornsen, S.E. (2009). Communicating/muting date rape: A co-cultural theoretical analysis of communication factors related to rape culture on a college campus. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 37* (4), 465-485. doi: 10.1080/00909880903233150

- Clark, M. (2014, September 27). Military overturns Lackland Air Force Base rape conviction. *MSNBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/military-overturns-lackland-air-force-base-rape-conviction>.
- Corprew III, C.S., Matthews, J.S. & Mitchell, A. (2014). Men at the crossroads: A profile analysis of hypermasculinity in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 22 (2), 105-121. doi: 10.3149/jms.2202.105
- Coyle, B.S., Wolan, D.L. & Van Horn, A.S. (1996). The prevalence of physical and sexual abuse in women veterans seeking care at a veterans affairs medical center. *Military Medicine*, 161, 588-593. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1997-07429-003>.
- Department of Defense. (2014). *Department of Defense annual report on sexual assault in the military: Fiscal year 2013* (RefID: 6-62C0DAB).
- Dougherty, D. and Smythe, M.J. (2004). Sensemaking, organizational culture, and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 32 (4), 293-317. doi: 10.1080/0090988042000275998
- Doyle, M. (2013, November 26). Military court questions Marine chief's tough talk on sexual assault. *The Sacramento Bee*. Retrieved from <http://www.sacbee.com/2013/11/26/5949084/military-court-questions-marine.html>.
- Enloe, C. (1993). *The morning after: Sexual politics at the end of the cold war*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Falcone, M. (2013). Fierce floor debate ahead on military sexual assault proposals. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/11/fierce-floor-debate-ahead-on-military-sexual-assault-proposals-the-note/>.

- Feldman, D. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21 (3), 433-452. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2391853>
- Fischl, J. (2014) About 14,000 men in the military were raped last year – almost none will report it. *Identities. Mic*. Retrieved from <http://mic.com/articles/99820/about-14-000-men-in-the-military-were-raped-last-year-almost-none-will-report-it>.
- Fox, L. (2013, November 18). Military sexual assault and the NSA among the key issues before the Senate. *US News & World Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/11/18/military-sexual-assault-and-the-nsa-among-the-key-issues-before-the-senate>.
- Gould, J. (2014, June 20). Army demotes general two grades; will retire as lieutenant colonel. *Army Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.armytimes.com/article/20140620/NEWS/306200058/Army-Brig-Gen-Sinclair-will-retire-lieutenant-colonel>.
- Greenberg, N. (2007). Culture: What is its effect on stress in the military?. *Military Medicine*, 172 (9), 931-935. Retrieved from <http://simonwessely.com/Downloads/Publications/Military/other/Greenberg%202007%20-%20culture.pdf>
- Haueter, J.A., Macan, T.H., Winter, J. (2003). Measurement of newcomer socialization: Construct validation of a multidimensional scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 20-39. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00017-9
- Holland, S.L. (2006). The dangers of playing dress-up: Popular representations of Jessica Lynch and the controversy regarding women in combat. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 92 (1), 27-50. doi: 10.1080/00335630600687123

- Howard, J.W., & Prividera, L.C. (2006). Gendered nationalism: a critical analysis of militarism, patriarchy, and the ideal soldier. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 30 (2), 134-145. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.siu.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=5&sid=328273dd-f182-4e1c-8161-4aa856719466%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4206&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=ufh&AN=20181859>
- Jablin, F.M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F.M. Jablin, L.L. Putnam, K.H. Roberts, L.W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 679-740). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kimerling, R., Gima, K., Smith, M.W., Street, A., & Frayne, S. (2007). The Veterans Health Administration and military sexual trauma. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97, 2160-2166. Retrieved from [http://empower-daphne.psy.unipd.it/userfiles/file/pdf/Kimerling%20R\\_%20-%202007.pdf](http://empower-daphne.psy.unipd.it/userfiles/file/pdf/Kimerling%20R_%20-%202007.pdf)
- Kramer, M.W. (2011). Toward a communication model for the socialization of voluntary members. *Communication Monographs*, 78 (2), 233-255. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2011.564640
- Lamothe, D. (2014, October 1). Army general, accused of sexual assault by senior adviser, retired quietly with demotion. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/checkpoint/wp/2014/10/01/army-general-accused-of-sexual-assault-by-senior-adviser-retired-quietly-with-demotion/>
- Levant, R. F. (1995). Male violence against female partners: Roots in male socialization and development. In C.D. Spielberger & J.G. Sarason (Eds.), *Stress and Emotion:*

*Anxiety, anger and curiosity* (Vol. 15, pp 91-100). Washington DC: Taylor and Francis.

Lonsway, K.A., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68 (4), 704-711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704

Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, K. (2012). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Morris, M. (1996). By force of arms: Rape, war, and military culture. *Duke Law Journal* 45 (4), 652-761. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1372997>

Mosher, D.L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring in a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18, 150-164. doi: 10.1016/0092-6566(84)90026-6

Mosher, D.L., & Tomkins, S.S. (1988). Scripting the macho man: Hypermasculine socialization and enculturation. *The Journal of Sex Research* 25 (1), 60-84. doi: 10.1080/00224498809551445

Murdoch, M., Pryor, J.B., Polusny, M.A., & Gackstetter, G.D. (2007). Functioning and psychiatric symptoms among military men and women exposed to sexual stressors. *Military Medicine*, 172, 718-725. Retrieved from <https://msrc.fsu.edu/system/files/Murdoch%20et%20al%202007%20Functioning%20and%20psychiatric%20symptoms%20among%20military%20men%20and%20women%20exposed%20to%20sexual%20stressors.pdf>

- Pacanowsky, M.E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46 (2), 115-130. doi: 10.1080/10570318209374072
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E.E. & Hackman, J. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Prividera, L.C., & Howard, J.W. (2006). Masculinity, whiteness, and the warrior hero: Perpetuating the strategic rhetoric of U.S. nationalism and the marginalization of women. *Women & Language*, 29 (2), 29-37. Retrieved from <http://www.womenandlanguage.org/OJS/index.php?journal=wandl&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=43>
- Rosen, L.N., & Martin, L. (1998). Incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment among male and female U.S. Army soldiers. *Military Psychology*, 10, 239-257. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/mil/10/4/239/>
- Schein, E.H. (1996). Three cultures of management: The key to organizational learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 38, 9-21. Retrieved from [http://cmapspublic.ihmc.us/rid=1255442538593\\_81326613\\_21696/Three%20cultures%20of%20management%20schein.pdf](http://cmapspublic.ihmc.us/rid=1255442538593_81326613_21696/Three%20cultures%20of%20management%20schein.pdf)
- Skinner, K.M., Kressin, N., Frayne, S., Tripp, T.J., Hankin, C.S., Miller, D.R., et al. (2000). The prevalence of military sexual assault among female veterans' administration outpatients. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15. 291-310. doi: 10.1177/088626000015003005
- Sorcher, S. (2013). How the military's 'bro' culture turns women into targets. *National Journal*, 2. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.siue.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=10&sid=328273>



dd-f182-4e1c-8161-

4aa856719466%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4206&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2Z

SZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=ulh&AN=90177813

Street, A.E., Gradus, J.L., Stafford, J., & Kelly, K. (2007). Gender differences in experiences of sexual harassment: Data from a male-dominated environment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*, 464-474. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/ccp/75/3/464/>

Thompson, Jr., E.H. & Cracco, Elizabeth J. (2008). Sexual aggression in bars: What college men can normalize. *Journal of Men's Studies, 16* (1), 82-96. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.siue.edu/10.3149/jms.1601.82>

Turchick, J.A., & Wilson, S.M. (2010). Sexual assault in the U.S. military: A review of the literature and recommendations for the future. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15* (4), 267-277. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2010.01.005

Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20* (2), 207-228. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2391695>

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E.H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Organizational Behavior I*, 209-264. doi: 10.1177/1534484302011004

Velicer, W.R., Huckel, L.H., & Hansen, C.E. (1989). A measurement model for measuring attitudes toward violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 349-364. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.siue.edu/10.1177/0146167289153006>

## Appendix A

### Informed Consent

#### Section I: Identification of Project and Responsible Investigator:

I hereby agree to participate in a research project to be conducted by Daniel Schmidt, with Zachary Schaefer serving as Faculty Supervisor. This study is part of Daniel Schmidt's Thesis project at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.

#### Section II: Participant Rights and Information:

##### **1. Purpose of the Project:**

The purpose of the study is to identify how military experience can influence violence normalization, sexual aggression, and gender marginalization.

##### **2. Description of Risks:**

Risks, if any, will be minimal. The principal investigator perceives no risks to participating in this study. Participation is completely voluntary, and participants can stop the questionnaire at any time. No information of participants' identification will be collected.

##### **3. Description of Benefits:**

The subjects will receive no direct benefit for participating in this study. Indirect benefits are that identifying the affects of combat exposure could possibly be used in the future to help the military to be a more inclusive and efficient organization.

##### **4. Disclosure of Alternative Procedures:**

There are no alternative procedures for this research except for non-participation.

##### **5. Confidentiality of Records:**

No information of participants' identification will be collected.

##### **6. Contact Information:**

If you have any questions about our research project or about your rights and activities as a participant, then please contact the project's principal investigator, Daniel Schmidt. You can call Mr. Schmidt at (618) 830-2264 or e-mail him at [daschmi@siue.edu](mailto:daschmi@siue.edu). If you have any questions about your rights or any other concerns, you may also contact Linda Skelton with the SIUE Institutional Review Board at (618) 650-2958 or [lkelto@siue.edu](mailto:lkelto@siue.edu).

##### **7. Statement of Voluntary Participation:**

Participation in this project is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled, and the subject may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

- I agree to the terms of the consent form
- I am at least 18 years old

## Appendix B

### Questionnaire

**Background- This section asks you to tell me a little bit more about yourself. Please indicate your answers in the space provided.**

1. Please indicate your gender. Male                      Female
2. Please indicate your age.(e.g. – 23) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Please indicate your Military entry date (month and year you joined the military – e.g. – 07/2010). \_\_\_\_\_
4. Please indicate your military grade (e.g. – E4) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Please indicate your primary MOS (e.g. – 11B) \_\_\_\_\_

**Socialization - This section asks you to tell me a little bit about your job. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement.**

1. I know the responsibilities, tasks and projects for which I am responsible  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
2. I understand how to perform the tasks that make up my job  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
3. I understand which job tasks and responsibilities have priority  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
4. I understand how to operate the equipment I use in my job (e.g., weapon, machinery, technical tools)  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
5. I know how to acquire resources need to perform my job (e.g., equipment, supplies)  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
6. I know who to ask for support when my job requires it  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
Strongly agree
7. I know who I support

- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
8. I know how to meet the requirements of those I support
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
9. I know when to inform my supervisor about my work (e.g., daily, weekly, close to deadlines)
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
10. I know what constitutes acceptable job performance (i.e., what does my supervisor expect from me)
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
11. In the course of performing my job, I understand how to complete any necessary forms/paperwork (e.g., reports, accountability)
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
12. I understand how my particular work group (e.g., team, squad, platoon) contributes to this unit's goals
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
13. I know my work group's (e.g., team, squad, platoon) objectives
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
14. I understand the relationship between my group (e.g., team, squad, platoon) and other groups
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
15. I understand the expertise (e.g., skill, knowledge) each member brings to my particular group (e.g., team, squad, platoon)
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |
16. I understand how each member's (individual Soldier) output contributes to the group's (e.g., team, squad, platoon) end service
- |  |                   |          |                            |       |
|--|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree |
|  | Strongly agree    |          |                            |       |

17. I understand what the group's supervisor (immediate supervisor) expects from the work group (e.g., team, squad, platoon)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
18. I understand the group supervisor's (immediate supervisor) management style (e.g., hands-on, participative)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
19. I know my work group (e.g., team, squad, platoon) role  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
20. When working as a group (e.g., team, squad, platoon) , I know how to perform tasks according to the group's standards  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
21. I know the policies, rules, and procedures of my work group (e.g., accountability, standards)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
22. I understand how to behave in a manner consistent with my work group's values and ideals  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
23. I understand the politics of the group (e.g., who is influential, what needs to be done to be promoted or maintain good standing)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
24. I know the specific functions provided by this unit  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
25. I know the history of this organization (e.g., when and how the Army was founded, how the Army has adapted over time)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
26. I know the structure of the Army (how the units fit together)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree

27. I understand the operations of the Army (e.g., who does what, how other branches contribute)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
28. I understand the Army's objectives and goals  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
29. I understand how various other units contribute to the Army's goals  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
30. I understand how my job contributes to the larger organization  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
31. I understand how to act in order to fit in with what the organization values and believes  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
32. I know the Army's overall policies and/or rules (e.g., pay/salary, uniform policy, smoking policy, weight program)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
33. I understand the internal politics within this organization (e.g., chain of command, who is influential, what needs to be done to be promoted or maintain good standing)  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
34. I understand the general management style (e.g., top-down, participative) used in this organization  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree
35. I understand what is meant when members use language (e.g., acronyms, abbreviations, nicknames) particular to this organization  
 Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree  
 Strongly agree

**Gender Roles - This section asks you to tell me a little bit about more about your beliefs about gender roles. Please indicate how similar the statement represents your beliefs.**

1. If another man made a pass at my girlfriend/wife, I would tell him off

- |     |                                                                            |                                  |                  |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 2.  | I believe sometimes you've got to fight or people will walk all over you   |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 3.  | I think women should date one man                                          |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 4.  | I think me who show their emotions frequently are sissies                  |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 5.  | I think men who show they are afraid are weak                              |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 6.  | I think men who cry are weak                                               |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 7.  | I don't get mad, I get even                                                |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 8.  | Even if I was afraid, I would never admit it                               |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 9.  | I consider men superior to women in intellect                              |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 10. | I think women who say they are feminists are just trying to be like men    |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 11. | I think women who are too independent need to be knocked down a peg or two |                                  |                  |
|     | Not at all like me<br>Like me                                              | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 12. | I don't feel guilty for long when I cheat on my girlfriend/wife            |                                  |                  |



- |                                                                              |                               |                                  |                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
|                                                                              | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 13. I know feminists want to be like men because men are better than women   | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 14. Women, generally, are not as smart as men                                | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 15. My attitude regarding casual sex is “the more the better”                | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 16. I would never forgive my wife if she was unfaithful                      | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 17. There are two kinds of women: the kind I date and the kind I would marry | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 18. I like to tell stories of my sexual experiences to my male friends       | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 19. I think it’s okay for men to be a little rough during sex                | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 20. If a woman struggles while we are having sex, it makes me feel strong    | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 21. I am my own master; no one tells me what to do                           | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 22. I try to avoid physical conflict                                         | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |
| 23. If someone challenges me, I let him see my anger                         | Not at all like me<br>Like me | Not much like me<br>Just like me | A little like me |

24. I wouldn't have sex with a woman who had been drinking  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
25. Sometimes I have to threaten people to make them do what they should  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
26. Many men are not as tough as me  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
27. I value power over other people  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
28. If a woman puts up a fight while we are having sex, it makes the sex more exciting  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
29. I don't mind using verbal or physical threats to get what I want  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
30. I think it is worse for a woman to be sexually unfaithful than for a man to be unfaithful  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
31. I think it's okay for teenage boys to have sex  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
32. I like to be in control of social situations  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
33. I prefer to watch contact sports like football or boxing  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
34. If I had a son I'd be sure to show him what a real man should do  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me

- |                                                                                             |                  |                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 35. If a woman thinks she's better than me, I'll show her                                   |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 36. I notice women most for their physical characteristics like their breasts or body shape |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 37. I think it's okay for men to date more than one woman                                   |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 38. I sometimes feel afraid                                                                 |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 39. I think men who stay home to take care of their children are just as weak as women      |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 40. I'd rather stay home and watch a movie than go out to a bar                             |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 41. I like to brag about my sexual conquests to my friends                                  |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 42. When something bad happens to me I feel sad                                             |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 43. I can date many women at the same time without commitment                               |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 44. I don't mind using physical violence to defend what I have                              |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |
| 45. I think men should be generally aggressive in their behavior                            |                  |                  |
| Not at all like me                                                                          | Not much like me | A little like me |
| Like me                                                                                     | Just like me     |                  |

46. I would initiate a fight if someone threatened me  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
47. Women need men to help them make up their minds  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
48. If some guy tries to make me look like a fool, I'll get him back  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
49. I consider myself quite superior to most other men  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
50. I get mad when something bad happens to me  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
51. I want the woman I marry to be pure  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
52. I like to be the boss  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
53. I like to think about the men I've beaten in physical fights  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
54. I would fight to defend myself if the other person threw the first punch  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
55. If another man mad a pass at my girlfriend/wife, I would want to beat him up  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me
56. Sometimes I have to threaten people to make them do what I want  
Not at all like me                      Not much like me                      A little like me  
Like me                                      Just like me

57. I think it's okay to have sex with a woman who is drunk

Not at all like me

Not much like me

A little like me

Like me

Just like me

58. If I exercise, I play a real sport like football or weight lifting

Not at all like me

Not much like me

A little like me

Like me

Just like me

59. I feel it is unfair for a woman to start something sexual but refuse to go through with it

Not at all like me

Not much like me

A little like me

Like me

Just like me

60. I often get mad

Not at all like me

Not much like me

A little like me

Like me

Just like me